DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 135 169 EC 093 051

AUTHOR Gershman, Janis
TITLE A Follow-Up Study of Graduates of the Perceptual and Behavioural Special Classes.
INSTITUTION Toronto Board of Education (Ontario). Research Dept.
REPORT NO ISSN-0316-8786
PUB DATE Nov 76
NOTE 38p.; Research Service No. 143

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Problems; Elementary Education; Exceptional Child Research; *Followup Studies; Learning Disabilities; *Perceptually Handicapped; *Program Evaluation; *Regular Class Placement; *Special Programs; Student Placement; Success Factors

ABSTRACT

Investigated with a follow-up study of successful reintegration into regular classes in the Toronto system was the success of two special programs for elementary level students who were identified as having learning disabilities presumed to be organic, or whose learning disabilities were primarily emotional or behavioral in origin. The initial sample of 295 students who entered either program in 1970 or 1971 were followed up by tracing their educational path from 1971 to September, 1975. By 1975, about half of the students still remaining in the Toronto system had been reintegrated into regular programs. The effect on later placement of age on entry to the program, sex, and length of time in the program was examined. Students who were found in regular programs in January, 1976, were examined further by collecting and comparing teacher ratings for those students and two matched groups. Generally, ratings were similar for the target group and the group matched on age (generally over-age for grade). However, ratings were lower for the target group than for a random group of class peers, especially in areas related directly to the problems which warranted their former special class placement. (Author/IM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED135169

ISSN 0316-8786

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A FOLLOW-UP STUDY OF GRADUATES OF THE PERCEPTUAL AND BEHAVIOURAL SPECIAL CLASSES

Janis Gershman

#143

November, 1976

EC093051

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
INTRODUCTION	1
PLAN OF STUDY	5
PHASE I - Tracing the Educational Path of Students in Special Program - Behavioural and Special Program - Perceptual	7
Length of Time in the Program	7
School Placement After the Program .	7
Summary	12
PHASE II - Follow-up of Graduates of Special Program - Behavioural and Special Program - Perceptual Placed in Regular Classes	14
The Sample	14
Procedures	15
The Questionnaire	15
Results	16
SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION	20
REFERENCES	23
APPENDIX	24

INTRODUCTION

Special education is a sensitive issue both in educational planning and educational research, and is one area of education that presents many serious problems in research methodology. Problems in evaluation methods arise because of vaguely defined success criteria, inappropriate measuring instruments, and difficulties in controlling variables in a naturalistic setting. Many past research attempts to evaluate special programs have produced ambiguous results and have often led administrators to plan programs based on intuition rather than on facts.

Follow-up studies in particular have been lacking in special education research. Added problems in doing follow-up studies are the high attrition rate caused by student mobility and the lengthy "waiting time" before seeing final results. Moreover, follow-up studies that have been done in the past decade have often yielded contradictory results.

In a five-year longitudinal study done by Koppitz (1971), the progress of 177 students entering a learning disability program was examined. The "successful" students who returned to regular classes within the five-year period comprised about 24% of the total sample. Follow-up of these students revealed that only half of them were making a good adjustment to regular classes.

Another follow-up study was done by Vacc (1972) in which he compared two groups of emotionally disturbed students. One group had experienced full-time special class placement. and the other group had remained in regular classes. After one year of the program test results were better for the students in the special classes. Four years later,

however, after the special class students had returned to regular classrooms for at least two years, test results indicated no difference in gains made in any area between the two groups. The author concluded that gains made in the special class were not sustained after the students returned to regular classes.

A similar phenomenon was found in an investigation of resource rooms (Glavin, 1974). Initial findings showed gains in both social behaviour and academic subjects for resource room pupils. However, two and three years later in full-time regular classes these pupils had not maintained their good performance.

In other studies, however, where students were observed in regular classes after experiencing special classes, positive results were found (Grosenick, 1969). The Scarborough Board of Education (Hayball and Dilling, 1969) also found that special class students who returned to regular classes were coping well with reintegration.

The reader is obviously advised to interpret cautiously the results of these past research studies. Possible explanations for the conflicting results are very small sample sizes and in most studies no systematic control of program, teacher, and pupil variables.

The overriding question guiding past studies and this project has to do with the status of former special education pupils. Said simply: How successful are the programs in reintegrating pupils into regular classes and how successful are these pupils once they have teturned to regular programs? Despite the simplicity of the question, operational criteria for determination of success and failure and complex, and review of relevant research demonstrates that they vary from study to study.

This particular study attempted to answer these questions for two specific full-time special programs -- namely Special Program - Behavioural and Special Program - Perceptual. The idea for the study developed a few years ago from a concern in the Special Education Department about the need to evaluate the quality of special programs. The study was initiated at the request of the Special Education Department and was a joint effort with the Research Department. One reason for selecting the Behavioural and Perceptual programs was that student enrolment was small enough to allow for a follow-up study that did not become unwieldy in terms of the time and effort needed to trace the educational path of each student. Moreover, the consultants concerned with these programs were interested in the results of such a follow-up procedure and had detailed records for all students who had experienced the programs.

Before a detailed plan of the study is given, perhaps a brief description of these two programs would be appropriate.

Special Program - Perceptual is a program designed to help students for whom tests indicate average or above average potential and who are unable to cope in a regular classroom because of learning disabilities presumed to be organic rather than behavioural in origin. Scattered scores on achievement and I.Q. tests, difficulty with motor skills, spatial organization, auditory or visual reception are some of the typical problems of many students in this program. The classes are small, fewer than 10 students in each, and are usually carefully structured to support students who are hyperactive and easily distracted. A goal of the program is to rehabilitate a student to the point where he can be completely independent academically, socially and emotionally in a regular class situation.

Special Program - Behavioural was developed to help meet the needs of children whose larning disabilities are primarily emotional or behavioural in origin and who cannot be contained within the regular grade classes. As in

the perceptual program, the classes are small and most teaching is done on a one-to-one basis. Most of the children admitted to the program have average or above average potential and remain in the program until their behavioural or emotional problems are overcome to the extent that they can be placed in a regular program or in some cases, another suitable special program.

Both of these problems were designed for students with relatively severe disabilities. Other programs (e.g., itinerant, withdrawal, learning centre, resource room) were developed for children with similar problems of a milder nature.

PLAN OF STUDY

Subjects

In 1970 and 1971 approximately 158 students entered Special Program - Perceptual and approximately 137 students joined Special Program - Behavioural. These 295 students comprised the initial sample of students to be followed up in this study.

The Perceptual program was composed largely of male students - (85%). Specifically, there were 134 males and 24 females. The distribution of males and females in the Behavioural program was similar (males 112 (82%) and females 25 (18%)).

The age at which a student entered the program varied for both programs from 6 years to 12 1/2 years. For the Perceptual program the average entry age was 9.3 years (s.d. 1.4) and for the Behavioural program it was 8.9 years (s.d. 1.6). There were no significant differences in either program between the entry age of males and females.

Follow-Up Procedure

Once the initial population was established, a follow-up procedure began to trace the educational history of these students from 1970 to the 1975-76 school year. With the help of the files of the Special Education consultants, the master computer file, and the files of the Student Services Department, the educational path of each pupil was determined.

The first phase of the follow-up procedure was designed to answer questions related to length of time in the program, placement after the program, and the effects of age and sex on these factors. The second phase of the follow-up procedure involved only those students who had been

reintegrated into regular classes. Each of these students was matched by sex and age with two other regular class peers, and teachers of these classes used the Teacher's Rating Questionnaire (Wyman & Wright, 1974) to assess the academic and social skills of these students. A more detailed discussion of the methodology and instruments used in the second phase will be presented after the results of the first phase.

PHASE I

Tracing the Educational Path of Students in Special Program - Behavioural and Special Program - Perceptual

The follow-up procedure began with an initial sample of 295 students (158 Perceptual, 137 Behavioural) who entered the program in either 1970 or in 1971. Tracing the educational status of each student through five years yielded the following results.

Length of Time in the Program

Perceptual. The average length of time spent in the Perceptual program was 2.1 years (s.d. = .7) but the range of time varied from half a year to over four years. There were a few students still in the program in September, 1975.

Behavioural. The average stay in this program, 1.4 years (s.d. = .8), was lower than in the Perceptual program. Again the amount of time varied from a few months to four years, although in September, 1975 none of the original sample was still in the program.

The length of time spent in the program did not vary by sex for students in the Perceptual program. However, the average length of time for females in the Behavioural program was slightly longer than for the male students, although the difference was not statistically significant.

Program	Male	Female
Perceptual	2.1 years	2.0 years
Behavioural	1.4 years	1.6 years

School Placement After the Program

The greatest percentage of students in both programs were placed in regular programs after experiencing special class placement. However,

many students (especially from the Behavioural program) did not remain in their initial placement. For example, two years after 48 students from the Behavioural program were placed initially in regular classes, 9 had left the Toronto system, 2 joined the Home Instruction program, and 3 were transferred into Special Program junior or senior. For this reason of high mobility, placement after the program will be examined in two "snapshots" - September, 1974 and September, 1975.

PERCEPTUAL PROGRAM GRADUATES

Placement	September, 1974	September, 1975
Regular Class	62 (39.2%)	58 (36.7%)
Special Program - Primary, Junior	23 (14.6%)	20 (12.7%)
Special Program - Senior	13 (8.2%)	15 (9.5%)
Home Instruction	2 (1.3%)	1 (.6%)
Still in Perceptual Class	24 (15.2%)	25 (15.8%)
Out of System	34 (21.5%)	39 (24.7%)

At both points in time, the largest group of graduates from the Perceptual program was in the regular program. The number of students who left the Toronto system increased only slightly from September, 1974 to September, 1975. Generally the distribution of graduates remained the same over the two-year period.

BEHAVIOURAL PROGRAM GRADUATES

Placement	September, 1974	September, 1975
Regular Class	48 (35.0%)	39 (28.5%)
Sprecial Program - Primary, Junior	20 (14.6%)	13 (9.5%)
Special Program - Senior	5 (3.6%)	9 (6.6%)
Home Instruction	22 (16.1%)	18 (13.1%)
Out of System	42 (30.7%)	58 (42.3%)

Unlike the Perceptual program, the number of graduates of the Behavioural program who left the Toronto system substantially increased by September, 1975. This confirms the results in a previous study which found a high mobility rate among students in the Behavioural program (Gershman & Wright, 1975). Many of the students who did leave the system went to treatment centres or other special programs outside Toronto (n = 17). Fourteen of the students who left Toronto entered regular programs. No information was available for the remaining students who left the system.

Sex and Follow-up

Male graduates and female graduates from either program did not seem to differ in terms of their placement after experiencing the special class. Equal percentages of males and females tended to be in the various placements indicated in the tables above.

Age and Follow-up

The importance of early identification has justified analyses relating age on entry to the program (i.e. related to age of identification) to placement after the special program. In a previous study, it was found that the younger children in the special class were more likely to be placed in regular classes after the special program (Gershman & Wright, 1975). The phenomenon, however, was not found in all special programs. The data in this study only partially supports the results found previously. Students were grouped by their age on entry to the program and their placement after the special class was examined. Students who had left the Toronto system were not included in the analysis. Results for the Perceptual program were as follows:

Age on Entry to Perceptual Program	Placement		Total
	Regular Class	Special Class	
Less than 8 years	6 (27%)	16 (73%)	22
8 to 9 years	21 (60%)	14 (40%)	35
9 to 10 years	15 (60%)	10 (40%)	25
10 to 11 years	11 (55%)	9 (45%)	20
Greater than 11 years	5 (29%)	12 (71%)	17
TOTAL	58	61	119

($x^2 = 9.96$, $.02 < p < .05$)

The table above reveals that the two groups of students most likely to be placed in special classes after the Perceptual program were the students who entered the program at a very young age (under 8) and students who were over 11. These results can partially be explained by the fact that the students who were identified at a very early age as having perceptual problems that warranted special class placement probably had more severe problems than students who entered the program at a later stage. The high percentage of students who entered the program at a very late stage and who did not graduate into regular programs supports the case for earlier identification and placement. Perhaps if these students had entered the program earlier, the percentage of "successful" students entering regular programs would have been higher.

No significant differences were found between students of different ages in the Behavioural program. Small numbers in each of the age groupings, however, made differences difficult to detect.

Length of Time in the Program and Follow-up

In a follow-up study of learning disabled students conducted by Koppitz (1971) it was found that the most "successful" students (i.e. those who returned to regular classes and were adequately coping there) spent from 2 to 3 years in the learning disability program. Students who spent a very short time in the program or greater than 3 years in the program tended to be less successful in terms of follow-up placement.

Although numbers in this study are small, this result has been confirmed for both the Perceptual and Behavioural Programs.

Perceptual

Years in Program	Regular Class	Special Class	Total
Less than 1.5 years	7 (50%)	7 (50%)	14
1.5 to 2.0 years	7 (64%)	4 (36%)	11
2.0 to 2.5 years	35 (71%)	14 (29%)	49
Greater than 2.5 years	9 (20%)	36 (80%)	45
TOTAL	58	61	119

($x^2 = 25.9$, $p < .001$)

Behavioural

Years in Program	Regular Class	Special Class	Total
Less than 1.0 years	4 (25%)	12 (75%)	16
1.0 to 1.5 years	12 (60%)	8 (40%)	20
1.5 to 2.0 years	7 (41%)	10 (59%)	17
2.0 to 2.5 years	13 (72%)	5 (28%)	18
Greater than 2.5 years	3 (38%)	5 (62%)	8
TOTAL	39	40	79

($x^2 = 9.37$, $.07 > p > .05$)

The highest percentage of graduates from both the Perceptual and Behavioural programs who were placed in regular classes was comprised of those students who had been in the programs for 2 to 2.5 years. However, caution should be taken in making conclusive statements because of the small numbers in many of the groups.

Summary

Of the 295 students who entered Special Program - Perceptual and Special Program - Behavioural in either 1970 or 1971, 97 students in September 1975 were in regular programs, 101 in special programs, and 97 had left the Toronto System. The breakdown for each program is as follows:

Perceptual: regular class - 58 (37%)
special class - 61 (39%)
(includes 25 students still in Perceptual program)
left system - 39 (24%)

Behavioural: regular class - 39 (28%)
special class - 40 (29%)
left system - 58 (43%)

Four years after entry to the special program, both programs had approximately equal numbers of students in special and regular programs. However, for the Perceptual class students, over one-third of the students classified as being in a special program were in fact still in a Perceptual class. The Behavioural program exhibited a much higher mobility factor with almost half of the original students leaving the Toronto System within five years.

The sex of a student or the age at which the student entered the program did not appear to be significant factors which influenced

placement after the special program. However, there was some indication that students who entered the Perceptual program at either a very young age (under 8) or relatively old age (over 11) were the ones most likely to be found in special classes after the program.

There was also some indication that the students who stayed in the Perceptual class or Behavioural class for a period of 2 to 2.5 years were the ones most likely to be placed in regular programs.

Examining the number of graduates of the special programs who were reintegrated into regular classes is only a very crude measure of program success. Some children's difficulties are such that to have helped them to be able to cope in another type of special program is a major achievement.

PHASE II
Follow-up of Graduates of Special Program - Behavioural and Special Program - Perceptual Placed in Regular Classes

The second phase of the follow-up procedure was designed to determine how the graduates from the two special programs, who were placed in regular classes, were coping socially and academically relative to their classmates in the regular program.

The Sample

As indicated in the previous section there were in September 1975, 39 students from the Behavioural class and 58 students from the Perceptual class who were in regular programs. Of these students, 73 (44 Perceptual, 29 Behavioural) were available for follow-up in January, 1976. Twelve students of the original group were in secondary schools and because of the Metro Toronto teacher's strike in January, no follow-up for these students could be obtained. The remaining students had left the Toronto system by January, 1976.

As a result, all of the students who were followed-up were in elementary schools. Seventy-five per cent of them were in grades 5 to 7. The greatest percentage of these students had been in regular classes for between one and two years and over 50% of them had spent 2 to 2.5 years in the special program.

In order to provide a comparison group each of the 73 students was matched with two regular class peers. One of these regular class peers was selected randomly from the same-sex members of the class and the other regular class peer was the same sex and the closest student in age to the target student. As a result of this process, two comparison groups existed -- one randomly selected matched on sex only, and the other, a

group that was the same sex and very close in age to the target sample. The latter group was established when it became apparent that many of the students from the special programs were slightly over-age for their grade. By using this extra control group, differences between the groups attributed to "being over-age" can be determined. Specifically, the average ages of the groups were as follows:

Program	Target Group	Control Groups	
		Matched	Random
Perceptual	12.5 years	12.3	11.8*
Behavioural	12.0 years	11.8	11.1*

* Significantly different from target group.

Procedures

The teachers of classes with students from the special programs were sent the Teachers' Rating Questionnaire with a letter of explanation asking them to rate the three selected students (the target student and the two peers).

Teachers were told that the purpose of the study was to do a follow-up study of achievement for a selected group of students. The fact that one of the students had been in a special program was not mentioned to guard against any bias by the teacher. In a few cases, a teacher had to rate six students because two of the target students were in that class.

The Questionnaire

The instrument, The Teachers' Rating Questionnaire (T.R.Q.) (Wyman & Wright, 1974), was developed by the Research Department and was designed to elicit teachers' perceptions of pupils in three general areas: academic performance and school ability, social-behavioural

adjustment, and creativity. The version of the questionnaire used in this study was the revised 3+ version, designed for students from grade 3 on (Wright & Wyman, 1974). The eleven questions with a five-point rating scale were designed to allow a teacher to compare a given pupil to other pupils in his/her class. A copy of the questionnaire, answer form, and letters to the teachers are included in the Appendix.

Results

The teachers were extremely cooperative in completing the ratings. Of the original 73 students in the target sample, 69 had complete follow-up information, as provided by the teachers. The teachers appeared to have little difficulty using the rating scale. Only three telephone calls were made by the teachers or principals to inquire about the study in general -- not about the use of the instrument.

In general, the results of the follow-up indicated that most of the students who had been in the special programs were making a fair adjustment to the regular class. Although they generally obtained slightly lower scores than the control groups, many had scores within or above the middle 50% of the random control group. Generally, their ratings were not significantly different statistically from the control group matched on age.

Of a possible score ranging from 0 to 88, the total scores for each group were as follows:

TEACHERS' RATINGS: TOTALS

	Perceptual	Behavioural
Target Group	41.3 (s.d. 10.1)	34.9 (s.d. 11.6)
Matched Group (small class, sex and age)	44.3 (s.d. 16.4)	41.3 (s.d. 16.0)
Random Group (same class and sex)	47.4* (s.d. 15.1)	48.1* (s.d. 13.3)

* Significantly different from the target group ($t = 2.7$ $p < .03$, $t = 3.9$ $p < .001$ respectively).

Taking the means of the randomly selected control group as a population mean, it can be calculated from the standard deviation that the average score of the Behavioural class graduate lies in the bottom sixth of the general student population. Of the 29 students from Behavioural classes in the target sample, 12 have total scores within the middle 50% of the estimated regular class population, and the remaining 17 have scores in the bottom quarter. For the Perceptual class graduates, of the 42 in the sample, 14 have scores within the middle 50%, 4 have scores in the top quarter, and 24 have scores in the bottom quarter.

Looking at subscores it can be seen that there are specific areas where the special class graduates are exhibiting weaknesses relative to their peers. For the Behavioural class graduates the area of greatest weakness is behaviour and discipline, whereas for the Perceptual program graduates it is general academic problems. The scores are as follows:

Subscore 1: General Academic Performance

	Perceptual	Behavioural
Target Group	16.9	15.7
Matched Group	18.8	17.2*
Random Group	20.2**	21.9**

* Significantly different from random group ($p < .02$).

** Significantly different from target group ($p < .01$).

Subscore 2: Social and Behavioural Skills

	Perceptual	Behavioural
Target Group	13.0	8.2
Matched Group	14.2	13.5*
Random Group	14.2	14.4*

* Significantly different from target group ($p < .001$).

Subscore 3: Creativity, Imagination

	Perceptual	Behavioural
Target Group	11.5	10.6
Matched Group	12.5	10.6
Random Group	12.9	12.3

* No significant differences.

The subscores reveal some important differences among the various groups of students. The graduates of both the Perceptual and Behavioural programs appear to be achieving slightly below their regular class peers in academic performance. However, they do not appear to be much different from students in their class of similar age. In fact, the students who were matched on age with the Behavioural class graduates were also achieving lower than their class peers in general achievement. Partly accounting for this phenomenon is the fact that many of the children in this group are over-age possibly because of difficulties experienced in general school performance.

In the area of social and behavioural skills, the graduates of the Behavioural program were rated significantly below both their same-age peers and randomly chosen peers. In general, graduates of the Perceptual class did not seem to be experiencing any difficulties in this area.

No significant differences were found between any of the groups when teachers' ratings of students' creativity and imagination were considered.

Variables, such as sex, age, time spent in the special program, and time spent in the regular program were examined to see if they had effects on adjustment in the regular class. None of these variables appeared to have any significant effect on how the target student was rated by his/her teacher relative to class peers. However, numbers in the sample are quite small and differences are therefore difficult to detect.

Summary

Generally, the results reveal that most graduates of the Perceptual and Behavioural program are coping in the regular class somewhat similarily to classmates of the same sex and age (slightly over-age). However, the average rating, given by a teacher using the TRQ, to a special class graduate relative to the rest of the class, generally younger in age, lies in the bottom sixth of a collection of ratings of "average" students.

From examination of subsections within the rating scale, it is evident that the special program graduates are receiving lower ratings than their peers in the areas that are directly related to the type of special program they experienced. For Behavioural class graduates, the greatest weakness is in the area of social-behavioural adjustment and for the Perceptual class graduates it is in general academic performance. Behavioural class graduates also exhibit some weakness relative to their "average" class peers in academic performance.

It is important to note that although the general trend appears somewhat negative, it is only a trend and there are thus some individual cases where special program graduates received very high teacher ratings relative to their regular class peers. Of the Perceptual group, 12 students (29%) received a total rating above the average of the random sample and of the Behavioural group, 4 students (16%) received ratings above the average.

Generally, one can conclude that special class graduates, now in regular programs, are rated by their teachers fairly similarily to other class peers of the same age and sex. However, when compared to the "average" class peer, the special class graduates are rated significantly lower in the areas in which they originally experienced difficultly before special class placement.

SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This follow-up study of students who experienced special programs (Behavioural and Perceptual) attempted to answer the question: How successful are the special programs in reintegrating students into regular classes, and how successful are these pupils once they have returned to regular programs?

From the data available, based on 295 students, there are conclusions, although somewhat limited, that one can make in response to this question. In general, it appears as though half of the students who enter the special programs and remain in the Toronto system are reintegrated into regular classes. For the Behavioural program the absolute number is quite small because almost half of the original group left the Toronto school system within the four-year follow-up period.

Of the students who have reintegrated into regular programs, most seem to be coping adequately in the regular classes. Although they are generally rated in the bottom third of the class, they are rated by their teachers as quite similar to other students in the same class who are of the same sex and age (usually slightly over-age). However, compared to randomly selected students of the same sex in the same class, they received considerably lower ratings as measured by the Teacher's Rating Questionnaire. Moreover, the areas in which the ratings were the lowest were areas directly related to the student's original problems. For Perceptual program graduates, general academic performance was the area of greatest weakness and for Behavioural class graduates it was academic performance and to a greater extent, social-behavioural adjustment.

The first phase of the follow-up study which traced the educational path of students in the Behavioural and Perceptual program revealed some interesting results relating the age of a student on entry to the program and to length of time spent in the program on the later class placement. A good case for early identification can be made based on the result that students who entered the Perceptual program at a relatively late age were more likely than younger students to be found in special classes four years later. The number of students in the Behavioural program was too small to reveal any differences.

Another interesting result related the length of time a student spent in the program to follow-up placement. For both programs a trend was found which indicated that the optimum length of time spent in the special class, in terms of the numbers found four years later in regular classes, was 2 to 2.5 years. However, numbers of students in both programs were small and the trend should be viewed cautiously.

No effects due to sex, time spent in the program, age on entry to the program, or time spent in the regular program were found on the ratings received by the reintegrated students relative to their classmates.

One can conclude then that Special Program - Behavioural and Special Program - Perceptual were successful in reintegrating students into the regular classes: by 1975 about half of the students who had entered these programs in 1970 or 1971 and remained in the Toronto system were in regular programs. These students seem to be coping in the regular class but relative to their classmates are still having some problems in the areas directly related to the problems which warranted their former special class placement.

The reader is reminded once again that cuation must be exercised in generalizing the results in this report, even to Perceptual and Behavioural programs in Toronto of a similar nature to the ones examined in this study. The results are not generalizable to other special programs.

REFERENCES

Gershman, J. The evaluation of special education programs: past attempts and present directions. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, Research Department, 1975 (#134).

Gershman, J., & Wright, E. N. Student "flow-through" in special education. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, Research Department, 1975 (#127).

Glavin, J. Behaviourally oriented resource rooms: a follow-up. Journal of Special Education, 1974, 8 (4), pp. 337-347.

Grosenick, J. Academic, social and sociometric behaviours involved in the integration of primary aged males from special education class into a regular public school class. Dissertation Abstracts, 1969, 30 (6-A), p. 2400.

Hayball, H. L., & Dilling, H. J. Study of students from special classes who have been returned to regular classes. Scarborough: Scarborough Board of Education, Research Department (no date).

Koppitz, E. M. Children with learning disabilities: a five year follow-up study. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1971.

Vacc, N. Long-term effects of special class intervention for emotionally disturbed children. Exceptional Children, 1972, 39 (1), pp. 15-22.

Wright, E. N., & Wyman, W. C. Trimming the TRQ (Revised Forms of the TRQ for Toronto Use). Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, Research Department, 1971, (#125).

Wyman, W. C., & Wright, E. N. Exploring the T.R.Q. - An assessment of the effectiveness of the teachers' rating questionnaire. Toronto: Toronto Board of Education, Research Department, 1972 (#123).

APPENDIX

ADMINISTRATION BOOKLET

TEACHERS' RATING QUESTIONNAIRE

(Grade 3+)

Revised Form 1974

Instructions

Specific criteria for you to follow in the rating of each question are stated in detail. These criteria provide the best means of obtaining uniform thinking regarding ratings, both for various pupils and for various teachers at various times of the year. These detailed criteria actually will assist in completing the rating questionnaire quickly and easily as you rate more of the students in your class.

1. Please read each question carefully.

2. Decide from your own knowledge the ratings for each pupil.

3. Record the rating for each pupil for every question.

SECTION ONE

1. Reading

Reads with comprehension and fluency; conveys meaning to listeners.

Rate 0 - Reads with little or no comprehension, mostly word by word, without much meaning.

Rate 2 - Reads with word recognition and comprehension at bottom level of class.

Rate 4 - Reads with comprehension and fluency; conveys meaning at middle level of class.

Rate 6 - Reads with word recognition and comprehension at top level of class.

Rate 8 - Superior reader, able to comprehend most material encountered, e.g., magazines and books at higher grade levels.

2. Mathematical Ability

Shows understanding of mathematical concepts and operations; can solve problems.

Rate 0 - Very limited ability to understand mathematical concepts and operations; cannot solve problems.

Rate 2 - Mathematical understanding and problem solving ability is at lower level of class.

Rate 4 - Usually able to understand mathematical concepts and operations when presented by teacher.

Rate 6 - Mathematical understanding and problem solving ability is at upper level of class.

Rate 8 - Superior mathematical ability; immediately understands mathematical ideas presented by teacher.

3. Language

Extent of vocabulary; correct grammatical usage of English; ability to express self clearly. (Both oral and written.)

Rate 0 - Generally very poor command of the language, frequently misunderstood, or cannot express self due to inadequate language.

Rate 2 - Language poor; on occasion is misunderstood.

Rate 4 - Command of language adequate; child still makes some grammatical errors.

Rate 6 - Good command of language; no grammatical mistakes.

Rate 8 - Extremely articulate for child this age; superior vocabulary, clear expression of ideas.

4. General Performance Level

The quality of work; diligence in performing it.

Rate 0 - Makes many errors; doesn't concentrate; seems uninterested in improvement.

Rate 2 - Makes an effort to concentrate, still has difficulty with work; quite a few errors.

Rate 4 - Listens; performs as required; relatively neat.

Rate 6 - Somewhat above average; diligent; few errors.

Rate 8 - Far above average; diligent; produces extremely accurate work.

5. School Ability

To provide your estimate of this child's ability, try to predict how far you think he will go (ignore financial ability of parents).

Rate 0 - Will have difficulty completing Grade Eight.

Rate 2 - Will not complete high school.

Rate 4 - Will complete high school.

Rate 6 - Will go to university.

Rate 8 - Will go beyond a B.A.

SECTION TWO

6. Discipline

Displays behaviour that you, the teacher, consider appropriate, for your classroom.

Rate 0 - Constant discipline problem; behaviour always inappropriate.

Rate 2 - Frequent discipline problem; behaviour often inappropriate.

Rate 4 - Occasional discipline problem; exercises some self control.

Rate 6 - Very seldom causes discipline problems; exercises self control most of the time.

Rate 8 - Never causes discipline problems; behaviour always appropriate.

7. Ability to Get Along

Interacts with most of his classmates in a satisfactory manner.

Rate 0 - Never able to get along in classroom (or in schoolyard).

Rate 2 - Frequently quarrelsome, or limits social contacts to one or two chosen friends.

Rate 4 - Gets along with most pupils, and regularly participates in group activities.

Rate 6 - Often shows leadership ability in group activities, and is popular with most classmates.

Rate 8 - Consistently shows leadership ability in social contacts, and is trusted by other children.

8. General Adjustment Evaluation

Considering all aspects of the child's adjustment to the classroom environment, evaluate his position.

Rate 0 - Quite out-of-place.

Rate 2 - Seems uncomfortable.

Rate 4 - Adequately adjusted.

Rate 6 - Makes consistent, conscientious efforts to improve himself in relation to his school world.

Rate 8 - Makes an effort to positively influence his classroom world.

SECTION THREE

For Your Guidance -- the following meanings are intended when these words are used:

Intuition - immediate insight;
- immediate apprehension by the mind without reasoning.

Divergent - capable of going in different directions;
- differ from the usual.

Inventiveness - ability to devise, or originate.

Imagination - mental faculty of forming images of external objects not present to the senses.

9. Use of Out-of-School Experiences in Class

Draws on background experiences, reading.

Rate 0 - Shows no background experiences; reports no information pertaining to the world about him.

Rate 2 - Shows a few background experiences; reports some information.

Rate 4 - Reasonably well informed.

Rate 6 - As a result of his background experiences, he is often able to contribute new information.

Rate 8 - As a result of his background experiences, regularly displays a wealth of knowledge. High degree of sensitivity to the world around him.

10. Imagination and Inventiveness

Regardless of academic achievement, he may be considered imaginative and inventive.

Rate 0 - Never shows imagination or inventiveness.

Rate 2 - Rarely shows imagination or inventiveness.

Rate 4 - Occasionally shows imagination or inventiveness.

Rate 6 - Frequently shows imagination or inventiveness.

Rate 8 - Regularly shows imagination or inventiveness.

11. Creativity

Shows an urge to explore and create; is intuitive.

Rate 0 - Always placid, never shows signs of curiosity; no capacity to be "disturbed."

Rate 2 - Rarely shows curiosity or the desire to explore.

Rate 4 - Occasionally displays signs of divergent thinking.

Rate 6 - Frequently displays signs of divergent thinking; has a great urge to explore.

Rate 8 - Regularly displays signs of divergent thinking; possesses the rare gift of immediate insight.

TEACHER'S RATING QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWER FORM

Pupil's Name _____ Group ____ (1) I.D. ____ (2 3 4 5 6 7)

Sex ____ (8) Birthdate ____ (9 10 11 12 13 14)

School ____ (15 16 17) Grade/Class ____ (18 19 20 21 22 23)

Teacher's Name _____

- PLEASE REFER TO THE ADMINISTRATION BOOKLET FOR A DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE RATINGS
- TOTALS NEED NOT BE CALCULATED

	RATING	(Rate 0, 2, 4, 6 or 8 for each of the 11 items.)
I		
1. Reading	____ (24)	
2. Mathematical Ability	____ (25)	
3. Language	____ (26)	
4. General Performance	____ (27)	
5. School Ability	____ (28)	
		Sub-total ____ (29 30)
II		
6. Discipline	____ (31)	
7. Ability to get Along	____ (32)	
8. General Adjustment	____ (33)	
		Sub-total ____ (34 35)
III		
9. Use of Out-of-school Experience	____ (36)	
10. Imagination and Inventiveness	____ (37)	
11. Creativity	____ (38)	
		Sub-total ____ (39 40)
		TOTAL ____ (41 42)

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO
155 College Street, Toronto M5T 1P6, Canada, 362-4931

International Women's Year, 1975

January 19, 1976

Dear

The Research Department of the Toronto Board of Education is carrying out a follow-up study of achievement for a small group of students. As part of this research we request your assistance in completing a teacher's rating questionnaire for the students whose names appear on the answer forms. If any of these students have left your class within the last few months please rely on your memory to complete the questionnaire. If a name appears for a student who left your class quite some time ago, either complete the form based on memory or indicate where the student can now be found.

We have included an answer sheet for each student on whom we need a rating and one administration booklet that explains the different ratings. There are only eleven items on the rating questionnaire and it should not take too long to complete one for each of the pupils indicated.

If you have any questions concerning the questionnaire please do not hesitate to call Janis Gershman at 362-4931 (Ext. 392).

Please return the answer forms in the enclosed envelope to the Research Department as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Janis Gershman

Janis Gershman

/wjs
Encl.

Duncan Green, Director of Education / Edward N. McKeown, Associate Director of Education
Gertrude M. Fatt, Superintendent of Professional Services / Mitchell Lennox, Superintendent of Curriculum & Program
Donald E. Ryerson, Superintendent of Personnel / Harry G. Facey, Comptroller of Buildings and Plant / David S. Paton, Comptroller of Finance

THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE CITY OF TORONTO
155 College Street, Toronto M5T 1P6, Canada, 362-4931

International Women's Year, 1975

February 4, 1976.

Dear

This letter is being written in regard to the study of achievement for which you recently received teacher rating questionnaire forms to complete.

We apologize for having to remind you about completing the forms but we have not yet received them from you. As this study involves a very small sample of students, it is important that we have complete data for each one.

If you have any questions about the study or need another set of forms please call Janis Gershman at 362-4931 Ext. 396.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Janis Gershman

Janis Gershman,
Research Assistant.

Edgar N. Wright

E. N. Wright, Ed.D.,
Director of Research.

/jh

Duncan Green, Director of Education / Edward N. McKeown, Associate Director of Education
Gertrude M. Fatt, Superintendent of Professional Services / Mitchell Lennox, Superintendent of Curriculum & Program
Donald E. Ryerson, Superintendent of Personnel / Harry G. Facey, Comptroller of Buildings and Plant / David S. Paton, Comptroller of Finance